



Memorandum

TO: COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC
PLAN TASK FORCE

FROM: Sal Yakubu

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON 12/14/04

DATE: January 3, 2005

Approved

Date

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Chris Augenstein (VTA), David Bischoff (City of Morgan Hill), Craig Breon (Santa Clara Audubon Society), Beverly Bryant (Home Builders Association of Northern California), Tedd Faraone (Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning), Mark Frederick (SCCounty Parks), Jane Mark (SCCounty Parks), Mike Griffis (SCCounty Roads), Carolyn McKennan (Morgan Hill Unified School District), Dunia Noel (LAFCO), and Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills).

City and Other Public Agency Staff Present:

Salifu Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE), and Sylvia Do (PBCE).

Consultants and Members of the Public:

Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Eileen Goodwin (APEX Strategies), Martha Feldman (UC Irvine), and Andrea Ballesteria (UC Irvine).

1. Update: 11/29/04 and 12/13/04 Task Force Meetings

The meeting convened at 3:00 p.m. with introductions around the room. Susan Walsh, Senior Planner with the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, reviewed the agenda and explained that infrastructure costs would not be covered since it was not discussed at the Task Force meeting on December 13, 2004.

Susan summarized the composite infrastructure modifications presented to the Task Force on November 29, 2004. She indicated that the lake has been decreased from 65 acres to 55 acres to create more developable land. Other changes include a redesign of the Parkway circulation design (to follow the Fisher Creek corridor) to improve circulation, and a redesign of the transit alignment to improve the integrity of some adjacent neighborhoods.

Roger Shanks, of the Dahlin Group, summarized the land use characteristics and distribution, infrastructure costs, and the Greenbelt Strategy presented to the Task Force on December 13, 2004. Roger explained the most important elements of creating a successful community, and described planning areas A through M in greater detail. He also indicated alternative sites for a second high school.

Eileen Goodwin, of APEX Strategies, indicated that the staff and consultants received negative feedback at the December 9, 2004 Greenbelt property owners meeting. She stated that approximately 50 property owners were not in favor of the Greenbelt Strategy because they feel that it will not add more value to their land. The property owners' preference is for a Strategy that allows for additional subdivision and a more secure funding source.

2. Modifications to the Composite Framework, Land Use Characteristics and Distribution, Greenbelt Strategy, and Infrastructure Costs

Eileen asked TAC members for their comments and the following were provided:

(a) Modifications to the Composite Framework

- Question as to how close the Parkway is to Fisher Creek. *Roger Shanks and Sal Yakubu indicated that although the parkway is adjacent to the creek, there would be adequate setbacks.*
- Advise against Laguna Seca playfields because it is the most important bird habitat in the Santa Clara Valley left.
- Question as to the number of lanes proposed for Bailey Over the Hill/Almaden Expressway. *Roger indicated that Bailey Over the Hill would have four undivided lanes.*
- Concern regarding the lake's water level. *Roger explained that it would be a year-round lake with fluctuating water levels within the freeboard.*

- Concern regarding the lake's water quality. *Roger stated that the lake would have appropriately treated water. He indicated that the possible water sources may include treated, recycled water from the Water Pollution Control Plant. Roger explained that there would be a water circulation system from the lake, through the canal and back to the lake.*
- Question as to whether the lake bottom would be permeable. *Roger stated that the lake would be lined to protect the groundwater.*
- Recommendation for an integrated transit system that would include all modes of transit. *Roger indicated that this would be a multi-modal transit system with connections to Caltrain, and other regional bus and shuttle systems.*
- Recommendation to obtain VTA's assistance in designing transit stations with innovative approaches to parking structures. (VTA indicated that they would send their comments regarding the station design to staff).
- Question as to whether the City Council would approve a preferred plan on January 25, 2005. *Sal indicated that the meeting would only be a progress report to receive the Council's feedback.*

(b) Land Use Characteristics and Distribution

Planning Area A

- Recommendation for a pedestrian/bicycle connection from the Bailey Gateway to the Coyote Creek Parkway. *Roger indicated that there would be a 5-foot wide sidewalk.*
- Question regarding infrastructure height limitations. *Roger explained that height would vary depending on infrastructure intensity.*
- Question regarding the high school and library's revised design. Roger said that the two story high school would have limited parking and be on 39 acres. He explained that the high school includes a 50-meter pool, and shared-use football and baseball fields. *Roger stated that classrooms and playfields meet State standards. He indicated that the library would have joint-use with the high school, and that the parking structure would have shared use on weekends.*
- Question regarding community pools. *Roger explained the conceptual locations for the 25-meter and 50-meter pools and indicated that they are planned for share use.*
- Question regarding pool operation. *Roger stated that this has not been determined yet. The pools would be a combination of public and private uses.*
- Support for community pools rather than private pools.
- Recommendation for the consolidation of pools.
- There is already a lake named "Coyote Lake."

Planning Area B

- Recommendation that there be a 200 foot minimum buffer along Coyote Creek.
- Recommendation that research and development (R&D) facilities be adjacent to Coyote Creek because it would result in less intrusion on the Coyote Creek Parkway.
- Recommendation that the Caltrain station be designed as a "fun place to be" (and include some retail) not just as transit station.

- Concern about residential units near Coyote Creek and their impacts to the creek.
- Recommendation that the area east of Monterey Road be open space and sports fields. If development needs to be located east of Monterey Road, recommendation for non-residential uses or higher infrastructure to preserve land.

Planning Area C

- Based on a Coyote Valley Research Park (CVRP) habitat agreement, no on/off ramps from Monterey Road to the Coyote Valley Parkway overpass are allowed. The overpass is to be designed to accommodate the De Anza regional trail without vehicular conflicts.

Planning Area D

- Indication that County Parks is developing a new master plan for the Coyote Creek Parkway.
- Concern regarding the adjacency of a very urban area to the creek.
- Concern about the number and hierarchy of access points into the Coyote Creek Parkway.
- Concern about the lack of an on and off ramp at the northerly interchange on the west side. *Roger indicated that there would need to be a full interchange. He explained that this is still a conceptual design at this point.*
- Concern locating new roads on existing parkland would be considered a “taking” of land. Recommendation that the land be replaced elsewhere.

Planning Area E

- Question as to why a highway interchange needs to go through the Coyote Creek Park Chain. *Sal and Susan recommended that staff and the consultants meet with the County Parks Department and discuss the design for this area.*

Planning Area F

- Question about whether the CVSP affects Cisco entitlements. *Darryl Boyd, Principal Planner with the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, explained that Cisco has an approved Planned Development Zoning and Planned Development permits, but has not applied for building permits yet.*
- What would happen if Cisco does not follow through with their plans? Sal explained that they are currently able to build out pursuant to their approved Planned Development Zoning or they may wait and build according to the CVSP.

Planning Area G

- Question about whether Bailey Avenue would have four lanes. *Darryl explained that this would be analyzed in the EIR.*
- Concern that many people would use Bailey Over the Hill and it will result in a lot of traffic. *Darryl Boyd indicated that the EIR would analyze traffic impacts associated with Bailey Over the Hill in greater detail.*

Planning Area H

- Question as to where the Parkway will end. *Roger explained the design of the Parkway.*

Planning Area I

- Question regarding the roundabout. *Roger explained that the point of having a roundabout is to eliminate the need for traffic signals.*

Planning Area J

- Question about how schools will have joint use if they are fenced. *Roger indicated that they are not at that stage in planning yet. There could be shared use access during non-school hours. Susan indicated that staff and the consultants would be reviewing some good examples of shared park and school use soon in an effort to come up with the best design.*

Planning Area K

- Question about whether there would be access from the foothills to the valley. *Roger indicated that that decision has not been made yet in the planning process.*
- Concern that there are too many single family detached residential units. *Roger explained that they would be designed at a minimum density of 10 DU/AC and that the single-family units would be on very small lots (similar to Rivermark).*
- Recommendation to provide access to the proposed memorial park on the Brandenburg property.

(c) Greenbelt Strategy

- Question as to the number of existing homes. *Roger stated that there are approximately 100 existing homes, with a potential build-out of an additional 100 homes.*
- Recommendation that there be an acquisition plan because zoning and land use could change.
- Recommend attaining 5+ acres of open parcels. *Roger indicated that this is costly and might be economically infeasible.*
- There is a need for 5-20 acre parcels for small agricultural uses.

(d) Infrastructure Costs

- Recommendation to keep costs down through shared parking.
- Recommendation that there be an infrastructure plan for the Greenbelt.
- Speculative about \$100,000 per acre in the Greenbelt. Suggestion that the value may be \$50,000 per acre. One property owner unsuccessfully tried to sell his land at \$75,000 per acre for over a year. *Susan indicated that staff would provide this information to the economic consultants and ask for their review.*
- Question about whether the City Council or Task Force has come up with any financing ideas. *Eileen indicated that infrastructure costs would be presented to the Task Force at their next meeting on January 10, 2005.*
- Indication that the largest parcels may be the cheapest land per acre.

- Question as to whether the CVSP would be correlated with other developments in the City (i.e. on North First Street). *Darryl indicated that this would be determined by the EIR.*

3. Next Steps:

Susan explained the next steps in the process and encouraged the TAC members to attend the community meeting on January 6, 2005 and the next Task Force meeting on January 10, 2005, where there will be a discussion of infrastructure feasibility and costs. She also indicated that the next TAC meeting would be on January 18, 2005.

4. Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.